

Dark energy from quantum fluctuations

Bogusław Broda* and Michał Szanecki**

Department of Theoretical Physics, University of Łódź, Pomorska 149/153, PL-90-236 Łódź, Poland

Received dd Mmmm 200Y, revised Dd Mmmm 200Y, accepted dD Mmmm 200Y

Published online DD Mmmmmmm 200Y

Key words Accelerated expansion, cosmological constant, quantum vacuum energy, Casimir effect, dark energy.

PACS 95.36.+x, 04.62.+v, 04.60.-m, 98.80.Es

We have derived the quantum vacuum pressure p_{vac} as a primary entity, removing a trivial and a gauge terms from the cosmological constant-like part (the zeroth term) of the effective action for a matter field. The quantum vacuum energy density $\tilde{\varrho}_{\text{vac}}$ appears a secondary entity, but both are of expected order. Moreover p_{vac} and $\tilde{\varrho}_{\text{vac}}$ are dynamical, and therefore they can be used in the Einstein equations. In particular, they could dynamically support the holographic dark energy model as well as the “thermodynamic” one.

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

In [1, 2] we have proposed an estimation method yielding a phenomenologically reasonable value of the quantum vacuum energy density [3, 4]. Not only the very order of this value is in accordance with our expectations but the very estimation procedure as well. More precisely, we follow an old idea to use quantum vacuum fluctuations as a physical constituent of dark energy (cosmological constant) [5].

Almost everybody knows the absurd, textbook estimation of the quantum vacuum energy density [3], cited as an example of a commonly acknowledged error,

$$\varrho_{\text{vac}} \approx \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^{\Lambda_{\text{UV}}} k^3 dk = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \Lambda_{\text{UV}}^4 \approx 3.4 \times 10^{94} \text{ kg/m}^3, \quad (1)$$

where the UV cutoff $\Lambda_{\text{UV}} = \Lambda_{\text{P}}$ (the planckian momentum), and $c = \hbar = 1$ for simplicity. Evidently, there is something wrong with the value (1), but what? One could, for example, argue that quantum vacuum energy does not couple to gravity but it would contradict the well-known arguments that all kinds of energy couple to gravity. Besides, the result $\varrho_{\text{vac}} = 0$ is not satisfactory either.

An inspiring visual hint is implicitly given by Polchinski in Figure (6.)1 of his paper [6]. Following his hint, which we hopefully have done, we have isolated and removed a purely vacuum loop term giving rise to the absurd, huge value (1). Such a standpoint and a realization of the corresponding estimation has been already successfully elaborated in [1, 2]. Therefore, here we will only remind key steps of that procedure. The estimation method is limited only to the flat Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker (FLRW) background geometry but it is sufficient for qualitative cosmological considerations.

The full quantum cosmological constant-like contribution from a single bosonic mode is of the form [1, 2]

$$S_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(4\pi G)^2} \int \sqrt{-g} d^4x, \quad (2)$$

* Corresponding author E-mail: bobroda@uni.lodz.pl, Phone: +48 42 6355673, Fax: +48 42 6785770

** E-mail: michalszanecki@wp.pl

which is obviously of the order (one fourth, for minkowskian $g_{\mu\nu}$) of (1). Eq. (2) can be derived, e.g., from the Schwinger–DeWitt [7] formula for the effective action of a free single bosonic field in an external gravitational background. Assuming the FLRW metric with the expansion parameter function $a(t)$, and next power expanding it around $a(0) = 1$ we get

$$a(t) = 1 + \dot{a}(0)t + \frac{1}{2}\ddot{a}(0)t^2 + \dots, \quad (3)$$

and consequently

$$\sqrt{-g} = \sqrt{(1 + 2H_0t + (1 - q_0)H_0^2t^2 + \dots)^3}. \quad (4)$$

The first term in the parentheses, number 1, corresponds to the trivial, purely vacuum, disconnected loop, and it can be removed. We should strongly stress that it is not an ad hoc step but a standard procedure in quantum field theory. It appears that by virtue of a gauge transformation generated by

$$\xi_\mu = \left(\frac{1}{2}H_0\mathbf{x}^2, -H_0tx^i \right), \quad (5)$$

the term linear in t can also be removed. Here we have assumed standard definitions for the Hubble expansion rate H_0 and the deceleration parameter q_0 :

$$H_0 \equiv \frac{\dot{a}(0)}{a(0)}, \quad q_0 \equiv -H_0^{-2}\ddot{a}(0). \quad (6)$$

Then,

$$\int L_{\text{eff}} dt \approx -\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(4\pi G)^2} \int \frac{3}{2} (1 - q_0) H_0^2 t^2 dt. \quad (7)$$

Since our considerations are, by construction, limited to an infinitesimal time t we can write

$$L_{\text{eff}} \approx -\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(4\pi G)^2} \lim_{T \rightarrow T_P} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \frac{3}{2} (1 - q_0) H_0^2 t^2 dt, \quad (8)$$

where we have physically interpreted the infinitesimal time as the planckian time T_P . Finally,

$$L_{\text{eff}} \approx -\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{(4\pi G)^2} \frac{1}{2} (1 - q_0) H_0^2 T_P^2 = -\frac{1}{128\pi^2 G} (1 - q_0) H_0^2. \quad (9)$$

Numerically, Eq. (9) yields

$$|L_{\text{eff}}| \sim 0.01 \varrho_{\text{crit}}/\text{mode}, \quad (10)$$

a very realistic result.

A new important observation we would like to present in this article is the possibility to rewrite Eq. (9) without the subscript “0” (at H and q) which bounds our considerations to our present time instant. We are entitled to do so because in our calculations there is nowhere explicit reference to our present epoch. In other words, we can perform the time expansion around $t = 0$ at any time instant because our present time instant is by no means distinguished in our estimation. This observation is really important because it means that Eq. (9) can be used not only to recover current value of the quantum vacuum energy density but to describe its dynamics as well.

First of all, we should notice that, strictly speaking, (9) is the quantum vacuum pressure rather the quantum vacuum energy density, as could seem at first sight. It simply follows exactly from the same (analogous) argumentation which says that energy density is equal to (minus) lagrangian density for time-independent fields. This time the fields are spatially-independent ($\partial_i \phi = 0$), and therefore emerges the pressure instead of the energy density. Namely,

$$p_i \equiv T_{ii} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \partial^i \phi} \partial_i \phi - g_{ii} \mathcal{L} = -g_{ii} \mathcal{L} \approx \mathcal{L}. \quad (11)$$

Summarizing all above, we have

$$p_{\text{vac}} = -\frac{N}{128\pi^2 G} (1-q) H^2 = -\frac{N}{128\pi^2 G} \left[\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 \right], \quad (12)$$

where N is an effective number of modes. E.g. $N = N_B - N_F$, i.e. N is the difference between the number of bosonic and fermionic fundamental modes (see, also [8] and [9]).

Using the Einstein (acceleration) equation

$$-qH^2 \equiv \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}(\varrho + 3p), \quad (13)$$

we can derive the quantum vacuum energy density $\tilde{\varrho}_{\text{vac}}$ from the quantum vacuum pressure p_{vac} . Namely

$$\tilde{\varrho}_{\text{vac}} = \frac{3}{8\pi G} \left[\frac{N}{16\pi} + q \left(2 - \frac{N}{16\pi} \right) \right] H^2. \quad (14)$$

Here the barotropic coefficient $\tilde{w}_{\text{vac}}$ is not constant but q -dependent, i.e.

$$\tilde{w}_{\text{vac}} \equiv \frac{p_{\text{vac}}}{\tilde{\varrho}_{\text{vac}}} = -\frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{32\pi q}{N(1-q)}}. \quad (15)$$

For example, for $\tilde{w} \sim -1$ and $q \sim -1$ we get $N \sim 100$, quite a realistic result.

One could wonder if such a simple use of Eq. (13) actually reproduces valid $\tilde{\varrho}_{\text{vac}}$ from p_{vac} . In a limited sense, i.e. when there are no other sources of gravitational field, it is really so. One needs the pressure p_{vac} or the energy density $\tilde{\varrho}_{\text{vac}}$ to insert it to one of the Einstein equations. One can work with p or with $\tilde{\varrho}$, but for consistency, to be sure that classical einsteinian calculations will be identical, Eq. (13) should be satisfied. Therefore, in spite of the fact that only true p_{vac} is directly accessible one can consistently, though in an above limited context, use $\tilde{\varrho}_{\text{vac}}$ coming from Eq. (13) as an equivalent of a true quantum vacuum energy density. This limited equivalency is denoted by “ $\sim$ ”, but we can still work with a generally valid p_{vac} if necessary.

Rewriting Eq. (14) in terms of H and $\dot{H}$ we obtain

$$\tilde{\varrho}_{\text{vac}} = \frac{3}{8\pi G} \left[\left(\frac{N}{8\pi} - 2 \right) H^2 + \left(\frac{N}{16\pi} - 2 \right) \dot{H} \right], \quad (16)$$

which is exactly the form of the vacuum energy density postulated in the framework of (an extended) holographic dark energy model in [10]. The holographic expression

$$\varrho_{\text{hol}} = \frac{3}{8\pi G} (\alpha H^2 + \beta \dot{H}), \quad (17)$$

contains two, in principle, arbitrary parameters α and β . The origin of (17) in the framework of the holographic principle is in a sense “kinematical”, i.e. it lacks any dynamical support. Therefore our analysis could serve as a dynamical explanation of Eq. (17) with α and β fixed by dynamics, i.e.

$$\alpha = \frac{N}{8\pi} - 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \frac{N}{16\pi} - 2. \quad (18)$$

One could also use our dynamical approach as a basis for Volovik’s thermodynamic, qualitative considerations [11]. Namely, using some general thermodynamic arguments and analogies coming from condensed matter physics Volovik argues that measured quantum vacuum energy density should be almost zero. Moreover, according to him, it should constantly run to zero in the course of the evolution of the Universe. Obviously, these qualitative considerations are not capable to yield any quantitative result. We like his point of view, and we think that, in a sense, our infinitesimal expansion around any consecutive time instant could be interpreted as realization of his idea.

We have shown that our primary approach [1, 2] aimed to estimate the current value of the quantum vacuum energy density ϱ_{vac}^0 can be successfully extended to the dynamical expression (14). Moreover, we have indicated a possibility to use our approach as a dynamical basis of the holographic and Volovik’s “thermodynamic” approaches.

Acknowledgements This work has been supported by the University of Łódź.

References

- [1] Broda, B., Bronowski, P., Ostrowski, M. & Szanecki, M., “*Vacuum Driven Accelerated Expansion*”, Ann. Phys. (Berlin), **17**, 855–863, 2008; [arXiv: 0708.0530].
- [2] Broda, B. & Szanecki, M., “*Quantum Vacuum and Accelerated Expansion*”, “*Dark Energy and Dark Matter: Observations, Experiments and Theories*”, EAS Publications Series **36**, 167–171 (2009); [arXiv: 0812.4892].
- [3] Weinberg, S., *The Cosmological Constant Problem*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1–23 (1989).
- [4] Carroll, S. M., *The Cosmological Constant*, Liv. Rev. Rel. **4** (2001); [arXiv: astro-ph/0004075].
Padmanabhan, T., *Cosmological Constant—the Weight of the Vacuum*, Phys. Rep. **380**, 235–320 (2003); [arXiv: hep-th/0212290].
Padmanabhan, T., *Dark Energy: Mystery of the Millennium*, AIP Conf. Proc. **861**, 179–196 (November 3, 2006) Albert Einstein Century International Conference; [arXiv: astro-ph/0603114].
- [5] Zel’dovich, Y. B., *Cosmological Constant and Elementary Particles*, JETP Lett. **6**, 316–317 (1967), translated from Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz., Pis’ma Redaktsiyu, **6** 883–884 (1967).
- [6] Polchinski, J., “*Rapporteur Talk: The Cosmological Constant and the String Landscape*”, “*THE QUANTUM STRUCTURE OF SPACE AND TIME*”, Proc. of the 23rd Solvay Conference on Physics Brussels, Belgium, 1–3 December 2005; 216–236 (World Scientific, 2007); [arXiv: hep-th/0603249].
- [7] DeWitt, B. S., *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime*, Phys. Rep. **19**, 295–357 (1975).
DeWitt, B. S., *The Global Approach to Quantum Field Theory*, (Clarendon Press, 2003).
- [8] Broda, B. & Szanecki, M., “*Induced Gravity and Gauge Interactions Revisited*”, Phys. Lett. B **674**, 64–68 (2009); [arXiv: 0809.4203].
- [9] Broda, B. & Szanecki, M., “*Vacuum Pressure, Dark Energy and Dark Matter*”, [arXiv: 0906.5078].
- [10] Granda, L. N., Cardona, W. & Oliveros, A., “*Current Observational Constraints on Holographic Dark Energy Model*”, [arXiv: 0910.0778].
Granda, L. N. & Oliveros A., “*Infrared Cut-off Proposal for the Holographic Density*”, Phys. Lett. B **669**, 275–277 (2008); [arXiv: 0810.3149].
Granda, L. N. & Oliveros A., “*New Infrared Cut-off for the Holographic Scalar Fields Models of Dark Energy*”, Phys. Lett. B **671**, 199–202 (2009); [arXiv: 0810.3663].
- [11] Volovik, G. E., *Vacuum Energy: Myths and Reality*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15**, 1987–2010 (2006); [arXiv: gr-qc/0604062].
Volovik, G. E., *Cosmological Constant and Vacuum Energy*, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **14**, 165–176 (2005); [arXiv: gr-qc/0405012].